DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 796 LI 004 244

AUTHOR	Harvey, John F.
TITLE	Dean Vs. Chairman.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	14p.; (0 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; College Deans; Comparative Analysis; Department Directors (School); *Educational Administration; Foreign Countries; *Library Education; *Library Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Drexel Institute of Technology; *Iran

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the field of library education administration and is based on observation, reflection, and analysis. The author was head of an American graduate library school for nine years, and immediately thereafter, 1967-68, as a Fulbright Professor, headed an Iranian library school for thirteen months. Rather than attempt to compare library education in the two countries, almost as large an undertaking as comparing the two parent institutions, Drexel University (then Drexel Institute of Technology), in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the Faculty of Education, University of Tehran, this analysis focuses primarily on a narrower and more manageable subject, the two positions themselves, dean vs. chairman. This is the story of their comparisons and contrasts, their rewards and problems, one important variable being held constant, the nature of the position as a university graduate library school headship. Most of the comparisons will be made after juxtaposing information from each position, topic by topic. (Related documents are: LI 004245 through LI 004267.) (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073796

DEAN VS. CHAIRMAN

This paper deals with the field of library education administration and is based on observation, reflection, and analysis. The author was head of an American graduate library school for nine years, and immediately thereafter, 1967-68, as a Fulbright Professor, headed an Iranian library school for thirteen months. Rather than attempt to compare library education in the two countries, almost as large an undertaking as comparing the two parent institutions, Drexel University (then Drexel Institute of Technology), in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the Faculty of Education, University of Tehran, this analysis focuses primarily on a narrower and more manageable subject, the two positions themselves, dean vs. chairman. This is the story of their comparisons and contrasts, their rewards and problems, one important variable being held constant, the nature of the position as a university graduate library school headship. Most of the comparisons will be made after juxtaposing information from each position, topic by topic.

In order to set the stage for the later confrontation, it is necessary to provide some background information for the reader. Iran's area was one and two thirds million square kilometers, equal to the entire American Middle West. With thirty million people, Iran was larger than America's two most populous states combined and larger than its twenty-five smallest states combined. The United States had 200 million people and nine and a third million square kilometers, but like Iran, its population was increasingly concentrated in large cities. The USA occupied part of an island continent, and, like Iran, has no neighbors which influenced it strongly.

Iran was a much older nation than the United States, the monarchy celebrating its 2,500th anniversary only a few years ago. Philadelphia was older than Tehran, surprisingly enough, but the American democratic government was formed less than 200 years ago. The United States was the world's chief proponant of individual freedom and capitalism. Youthful vigor, optimism, hard work, honesty, and mobility of all kinds had been its hallmarks for a century, but the stresses and strains of mid-20th century life were beginning to affect its morale. American society was more highly organized than Iranian in terms of voluntary groups and less highly organized in terms of family groups. Life style contrasts were enormous in both countries.

LI 004 244

Iran was a fatalistic nation of ancient traditions, much wealth among the elite,

extensive poverty among the vast majority, and much poorer per capita than America.. Oriental Iranian society was formally organized, socially graded and highly competitive. Innovation and imagination were uncommon in Iran, but common in America. The upper and middle classes were in some ways western-oriented with English use widespread in signs and periodicals, taught to every high school student, and popular as a university major. A partially socialistic approach was taken to Iran's basically capitalistic economic system. In 1967-68, Iran enjoyed an economic boom with middle class professionals able to afford more hard goods and even villagers seemingly having a better future. Transportation and communication were much superior and more extensive in the USA, but Iranian trains, buses, airlines, cars, telegraph, radio and television were moving forward, also.

The USA was a mecca for Iranians, incidentally, the pull of its obvious prosperity exceeding that of other countries on those persons who could afford the trip and secure the passports to go. Thousands of expatriate Iranians lived in warm and exciting southern California, and most of the passports were awarded to students for college attendance there. On the other hand, the majority of Americans had little interest in Iran or West Asia, and only a very few of them could read or speak Persian.

Philadelphia's metropolitan area contained almost five million people, and two million of them lived inside the city. Tehran counted more inside, three million, but had a smaller metropolitan area. 11% of Iran's population lived in Tehran, its largest city and capital, whereas only 1% of America's people lived in its fourth largest city, Philadelphia, not even a state capital. Philadelphia ranked much higher per capita than Tehran on most social, educational, cultural, and economic indices. However, nothing in the USA quite matched the pull of Tehran on migrating Iranians and the comparative concentration there of Iranian wealth, talent, cars, mini-skirted girls, government officials, tall buildings, entertainment, and educational facilities.

American university education was largely independent of the national government, though most higher institutions were supported and to some extent controlled by a semi-independent agency functioning at a lower government level. Drexel, however, was very private and very independent, though a small amount of its income, too, came from the state and national governments. Relatively young for an American university, about three quarters of a century old, decentralized

Drexel had 13,000 full and part-time students, smaller than the University of Tehran, and the curriculum was narrow and restricted as one might expect in a technical university. Its students were in engineering, more than 50% of them, business administration, basic science, home economics, and finally, library science. Drexel's science and engineering curricula demanded high entrance qualifications in science and mathematics, more modest qualifications in English and other fields. Other Drexel curricula were selective in varying degrees. 10% of the enrollment were graduate students, 90% were male, with but a small percent from outside its Middle Atlantic area. Doctoral programs existed in two specialized engineering fields only. Tuition was high, about $500 per quarter, but financial rewards were substantial for American higher education graduates.

Iran had national government control over all public and even to some extent over private education. The University of Tehran was Iran's first higher institution in modern times, thirty-five years old, originally French-influenced, very oriental in its apparent centralization but actual decentralization, paying poor salaries to moon-lighting faculty members, a West Asian government university. The chancellor was appointed by the Prime Minister, and University red tape and resistance to change were legendary. Tehran had twenty thousand full-time students representing all Iranian provinces, about 80% of them male, and about 5% of the undergraduate applicants being accepted. English competance was one of the entrance requirements.

The number of courses Tehran offered, many hundreds of them, was quite large and varied, from accounting to zoology. Tuition was low, about $65 per semester for a full graduate schedule. The University was moving toward increased emphasis on graduate work, though only 10% of its present enrollment were graduate students. Doctoral programs existed in twenty or more subject fields, but only a small number of students completed them each year. Education was rewarded with good salaries in Iranian government employment, the four determinents of salary there being years of schooling, years of experience, position level, and skill in bargaining with one's supervisor.

American libraries of all kinds were among the world's best supported, largest per capita and most successful, and they had relatively well educated staff members, also. In contrast, Iranian libraries were generally quite conservative, inactive, and small, though a few were organized along modern, western lines by professional librarians. Professional library positions existed in Iranian higher educational

institutions and ministries only, and all of them were controlled by the national government.

The USA had many more library schools than Iran and pioneered library education for the world, eighty years ago. A dozen of its schools awarded doctorates, while none in Iran did so. The Drexel library school was one of the oldest and largest of forty accredited schools, while the Tehran department was the first and only one in Iran. In 1967, the latter department was only one year old, but the Drexel school was seventy-five years old. At each library school, all of the previous heads had been women. The author was dean of the Graduate School of Library Science, Drexel, then chairman (or more properly, acting chairman) of the University of Tehran Faculty of Education Department of Library Science. Obviously, at Drexel, the position carried a higher status, where it ranked among the top dozen institution offices, than at Tehran, where the foreign chairman had no official rank and even unofficially fell behind thirty chancellors and deans and a hundred department chairmen.

At Drexel, the dean reported to the vice-president for academic affairs, and at Tehran, the chairman reported to the Faculty of Education dean. The Drexel vice-president understood little about libraries and was busy with other problems whereas the Tehran dean was quite knowledgable about libraries but seldom interfered with departmental operation. Occasional conferences were held in the Drexel vice-president's office, usually at his request, but conferences were held with the Tehran dean several times a week, usually at the chairman's request. Occasional dean's coordinating meetings were called by the Drexel administration, and occasional dean's meetings were held in Tehran, also, but in Persian, thereby excluding the foreign chairman. In each position, the head had a great deal of freedom with which to operate, or perhaps he simply took a great deal of freedom.

Drexel's annual budget was negotiated with the academic vice-president. It was appropriated in fifteen categories for the fiscal year beginning July 1st. Tehran had no departmental budget, and all financial matters were handled by the dean whose fiscal year began March 21st. Money was appropriated to the Tehran dean in two categories, salaries on the one hand, and everything else on the other hand. He could allocate the latter with some freedom, but the salary budget was much less flexible. The Drexel school's budget was $350,000 per year, while the Tehran department's budget was $24,000 per year. Tehran had very little money for such things as travel, research and equipment, while Drexel was generously

budgeted in these areas. The Drexel dean's salary was about twice the Tehran Fulbright professor's salary, and the University of Tehran paid him nothing. A financial report came monthly from the Drexel business office to be reconciled with the school's own financial figures, but no Tehran financial report was ever seen.

Quarters provided a sharp contrast in Philadelphia and Tehran. In Philadelphia, the library school occupied a 3,000 square meter red brick office building with a rose garden and parking lot located at the edge of the downtown campus. The Tehran concrete and plate glass faculty office and classroom building sat on a busy residential boulevard a kilometer from the main campus and another kilometer from the downtown area.

At Tehran, the chairman's desk was located near the south window of the department's tiled second floor office. Room 202 held other desks for the secretary and the faculty members, as well as files and shelving for curricular material and mail, about twenty-three square meters in all. At Drexel, the dean had a carpeted private office of twenty square meters with a secretary across the hall. The chairman's Tehran desk was gray-painted metal, while the dean's Drexel desk was dark brown wood with a white plastic top. A plastic telephone, desk calendar and ash tray sat on each desk. Four vertical files were conveniently located for his filing at Tehran, but they sat in the secretary-receptionist-filer's office at Drexel. The dean had a dictaphone in Philadelphia, but there was none for the chairman in Tehran. He opened both the Drexel mail and the Tehran mail each day.

At Drexel, the dean supervised ten full-time and twenty-five part-time faculty members, while at Tehran the chairman supervised two full-time American Fulbright and eight part-time Iranian faculty members. Several Drexel faculty members had 10-20 years of teaching or library experience and fine national reputations. The Tehran faculty body included some of Iran's leading librarians. Their library experience ranged from three to eighteen years, and their library school teaching experience was a maximum of one year. Faculty recruitment was the dean or chairman's responsibility in both places, and in both, it was much easier to locate superior part-time than competent full-time faculty members. No full-time faculty members were hired at Tehran, but a dozen were hired in the years at Drexel.

The Tehran clerical staff consisted of one 75% time secretary, two 50% time typists paid by the Fulbright Commission, and a Faculty typing and duplicating pool shared

with other departments. Drexel had eight full-time and fifteen part-time sub-professional and clerical employees, including a typing pool and five administrative assistants. Most of the Tehran secretaries and typists worked very hard, while the Drexel secretaries and typists varied greatly in this respect.

At Tehran, the chairman did all student course scheduling, counselling and enrollment. At Drexel, the dean did most of the course scheduling, but administrative assistants carried out counselling and enrollment. Record keeping for admission, placement, course work, faculty and student evaluations was his Tehran responsibility, but at Drexel it was split among the University admission office, the school placement director, registrar, and director of students.

Placement work was the chairman's responsibility at Tehran, but not at Drexel, where a full-time placement director handled it. A shortage of librarians existed in both places. Most of the positions which Drexel was trying to fill were well established and a vacancy certainly existed for each one. At Tehran, the situation was less clear, apparently certain employers liking the idea of hiring professional librarians but not caring to pay master's degree level salaries for them. Consequently, Drexel was more successful in placing students than was Tehran.

Drexel admissions were handled by the University admissions office with some coaching from the library school director of students. The chairman handled all Tehran admissions, interviewing and evaluation, with English testing being handled by the Faculty of Education English Department. Drexel required a B average from its well qualified applicants and rejected one third of them. Tehran rejected two thirds of its poorly qualified applicants, based mostly on their English examination scores, and required no specific undergraduate grade point average. Drexel's enrollment was 500 students while Tehran's enrollment was 60 students. The chairman advised the Tehran student club, while the Drexel student body officer received the director of students' advice.

The average Iranian library school student was alert, distractable, talkative, good-looking, stylish, female, looked to Europe or America for cultural, intellectual, economic and political leadership, was fatalistic, intelligent, more concerned with appearance than with reality, eager for a higher salary and social status, a full-time but not very hard-working government employee.

The American library school student was more difficult to typify than was his more

conformist and less imaginative Iranian counterpart. The Drexel student seemed relatively more intelligent and hard-working, somewhat more curious about intellectual matters, again female in large proportion, to possess no more leadership characteristics, and to be noticeably less concerned about appearance. American students were proud, sensitive, unaggressive, and worked primarily for government agencies, but they were somewhat more secure and straightforward in inter-personal dealings than were Iranian students, also. Hard goods were very important to both groups.

The dean-chairman prepared the agenda and presided over the monthly faculty meetings of both schools. Curriculum revision planning was mostly in his hands in both schools, also, but it was shared with several Drexel faculty members and with a Tehran faculty steering committee. Both curricula were pitched on the graduate level, though Tehran had a core curriculum composed of four senior-graduate level courses. The two schools' curricula were surprisingly similar, though the Tehran curriculum consisted of required courses only, while the Drexel curriculum was much richer. Both schools had been influenced by the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science curriculum, due to the dean and chairman's contact with it. Though English was widely understood, the University of Tehran teaching language was Persian. Drexel was monolingual and English-speaking, of course. In both places the language of library science instruction was English, a handicap for Iranian and a boon for American students.

Book selection occupied some of the Philadelphia dean's time but very little of the Tehran chairman's time. The library science book collection contained 25,000 volumes in Philadelphia and 800 volumes in Tehran. Serial subscriptions totalled 200 in Philadelphia and 15 in Tehran. Both the chairman and the dean were able to persuade several American encyclopedia publishers to deposit copies of their sets for student use. The dean doubled as director of the Drexel University Library for his first five years and as director of the Drexel Press for his last four years on the campus, whereas the Tehran chairman had neither library nor press responsibilities.

During most of the Drexel period, the dean's teaching load was one course per year, but the Tehran chairman's load was six courses per year. In class, the Philadelphia students asked few questions, did their assignments conscientiously, paid attention to lectures and generally enjoyed the course. Even though it was

much "watered down" for them, the Tehran students asked even fewer questions, did their assignments rarely, paid attention poorly, and were very fearful of the course. The courses were carried out in much the same way in both places.

Naturally, a great many ideas and techniques were transferred directly from Philadelphia to Tehran. For instance, faculty meeting agenda looked surprisingly similar, as did the two faculty evaluation forms. It might be thought that advising faculty members on teaching methods would be a much more common responsibility in the Tehran position than in the Philadelphia position, but this contrast was smaller than expected. Some faculty members asked for advice in each country.

Visiting libraries was an important and enjoyable administrative sideline in both positions. On library visits, sometimes the chairman was allowed to use the Tehran dean's University car, and at Drexel, often the dean used University cars. In Tehran, much consulting work fell into his hands, and many hours were spent on report preparation. Relatively little consulting work was required by Philadelphia libraries, and other faculty members did most of that. Conference planning was another important Drexel responsibility, while monthly public program planning was a Tehran responsibility. With the aid of a research assistant, some Philadelphia time was spent on research projects, but such projects received no Tehran attention.

In Philadelphia, the dean represented Drexel and the library profession in the large Philadelphia Rotary Club. He belonged to two Philadelphia social clubs, the Dartmouth Club and the Alpha Club, which housed numerous library meetings under his chairmanship. He belonged to men's librarians' clubs in New York and Philadelphia and to a dozen or so local associations for school, special, medical, college, information science, and general librarians. Representing Drexel at their meetings required some of his attention. Of course, state and national library organization participation was part of his responsibility, also. Before leaving Philadelphia, the dean founded three more librarians' associations.

In Tehran, the chairman belonged to Le Cercle des Amities Francaise, a Persian language social club with an excellent dining room where dinner meetings were often held. He belonged to the Iranian Library Association, which met occasionally, and founded the Department of Library Science Alumni Association. Also, the chairman represented the department in two English language luncheon clubs, the Iran Management Association, for Iranians, and the American Business and Professional Men's Association, for Americans. He held no offices in any of the local organ-

izations in either city.

In Philadelphia, the dean lived in a suburban house, a fifteen kilometer drive from the office, while in Tehran, the chairman lived in a city penthouse, a two kilometer walk from the office. Many Philadelphia evenings were spent at home editing publications or working on office papers, while Tehran evenings were spent at home writing survey reports and working on office papers.

In both cities, the library school seemed to be the most modern campus teaching unit and was criticized for that reason. The Drexel dean sought to change the school's name in order to include the modern field of information science but was refused and criticized for fear this would somehow inconvenience the engineering school. Often, on both campuses, library school students sent elsewhere for course work reported inept and traditional teaching methods to be used. Closed circuit television teaching, role playing sessions, team teaching, visiting lecturers and class field trips were used much more extensively in the library school than in other Drexel schools. The last three methods were used in a pioneering manner in Tehran, also, and the department was criticized for it.

Obviously, the dean-chairman's feelings of self confidence and freedom were somewhat weaker in Tehran than in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia school and position were well established, and some prestige was attached to them. Not so in Tehran. The chairman was not well informed about how to conduct business there, and his authority was more apparent than real. The University did not "officially" recognize either the department or the chairman, though it was never clear what that meant, and the situation seemed not seriously to inhibit departmental activities.

The dean-chairman's success in the two positions was hard to estimate. Perhaps success should have been greater at Drexel, due to a longer tour of duty there. On the other hand, the Iranian department was much simpler to operate, and the prior library education experience should have been helpful. At any rate, many successes and some failures were part of the experience in each school.

So much for the Drexel University-University of Tehran description. Now, for the analysis. While this paper has recognized many contrasts between the dean and the chairman and their environments, the paper's purpose is to locate similarities between the two, not differences. What factors were quite similar in the roles of the dean and the chairman? What were the most notable comparisons in the two situations? Many factors were similar and could be listed, but only

the most significant ones will be considered here. We are looking for generalizations which may be provable in several countries eventually. This is a list of the USA-Iran similarities observed:

1. Each country had a library personnel shortage.
2. Most of the library school students were being educated to fill positions located in government organizations.
3. Most of the students were women.
4. The curricula were taught in English.
5. The curricula were offered on a graduate level.
6. Each nation had a scarcity of available and well qualified full-time faculty candidates.
7. The dean-chairman was responsible for both faculty recruitment and curriculum revision.
8. The dean-chairman played a strong leadership role. This leadership role seemed noteworthy not so much for one leader's aggressiveness as for faculty submissiveness or lack of interest in school business.
9. The dean-chairman operated with a great deal of freedom.
10. Each one of the two positions seemed to require much overtime before its tasks were completed.
11. Several professional library obligations were carried out through social and professional clubs and associations.
12. Each school was a comparatively modern agency in a conservative institution.
13. Other factors of comparison existed, of course, but they seemed to suggest primarily that the same person sat in both chairs.

Now, for which ones of these position likenesses can we understand the motivations, the social, intellectual or library background, the causal factors? Unfortunately, we lack the library school data needed to prove the above generalizations, and we lack the social data needed to place them properly in their societal settings. Consequently, the entire display of proof must be subjective, rationalistic, and brief. Probably, the reader can find explanations for some of these generalizations himself. Certainly, if he has read others of this author's Iranian library papers, he can complete some of the background information on these points. Obviously, the strong American influence in Tehran caused the presence of many similar factors.

Number 12 can be suspected of resulting from (a) the American influence in Tehran,

and (b) the special circumstances existing at technically oriented Drexel. Certain items, like 10, seem, to some extent, to be inconsequential. It would seem that items 1 and 2 are closely related, or that 1 is caused partly by the conditions in 2. Probably 2 is somewhat related to 3, also. Apparently, items 3, 4, and 5 relate to the comparative modernity of the young women in both countries which, in turn, influenced them to major in English and then to seek an English language graduate curriculum leading to a suitable occupation.

Since items 2 and 3 seem pivotal, let us attempt to analyse the placement dominance of government positions and the enrollment dominance of women. Perhaps we can discover common causes between them. First, we will discuss number 2. Presumably, there is little need to define government institutions--institutions at any level, town, county, shahrestan, ostan, state or national, supported primarily by the state, by the taxpayers, by the people, public rather than private, and institutions having public control, are encompassed here. Number 2 should not be misconstrued, however. In both countries, students were prepared for government positions because non-government positions existed in small numbers only. In the USA, some of the students could expect to spend parts of their careers, sometimes all of their careers, in private institutions, but only a small group of them had this expectation, and no Iranian student had any such expectation.

Let it be said, further, that item 2 seems to be a generalization of fundamental importance to any nation. In Iran, most school, most college, all university, all public and most special libraries existed in government institutions. In the USA, most school, a majority of college, a majority of university, all public, and a majority of special libraries existed in government institutions. Of course, most Iranian institutions were those of the national government, while in the USA, several government levels were represented. Also, most of the American library positions belonged to government agencies enjoying some degree of independence from the central city or state government and possessing their own board of directors or tax support.

In both countries, libraries were characterized by a close affiliation with formal and informal education, also. Government dominance in public schooling sprang from the social philosophy that the government should provide certain large scale and specialized public services which its citizens would have had difficulty in providing for themselves. Water supply, police protection, street maintenance,

and postal service were other service examples. Since education was a government responsibility in both countries, then library provision became a government responsibility in both countries, also. In fact, it is doubtful that many countries existed where librarianship was not basically a government responsibility. This generalization demonstrated the dominance of the government in each country's life, particularly in its education life.

A government which bulked large in national employment, particularly one which was in many ways larger and more active than private industry, could be expected to develop libraries in its government bureaus and ministries, and to develop them in larger numbers than did private industry. Government ministries tended to attract certain relatively well educated staff members who wanted places in which to deposit printed material and who wanted to consult it sometimes, also. Even in a very underdeveloped country like Afghanistan, libraries existed in several government ministries, and they greatly outnumbered private industry special libraries.

Of course, public libraries can hardly be imagined without government sponsorship, though a very few private public libraries existed, e.g., in Philadelphia and in Kerman, Iran. Governments, often at a local level, took responsibility for public library service in the same way that they took responsibility for public school service. Their interest in the adult education aspect of the public library's work, in its back up relationship to the public schools, and in its public recreation function must have accounted for this sponsorship. While no data are available here to support the statement, it seems possible that more than three fourths of the world's libraries were school and public libraries, many of them very small and most of them sponsored by government agencies.

Government sponsorship of higher education was not assumed with the universality which characterized government sponsorship of elementary and secondary education. In the USA, for instance, government agencies sponsored no more than two thirds of the existing colleges and universities. However, that number was still a majority. Probably some strong degree of government sponsorship was present in a large percent of the world's higher institutions. Why was this true? Because of the expense of operating a college or university, the broad scale importance of higher education to a nation's cultural and occupational life, and the logic of including the third stage of educational service as long as the first two stages were already government responsibilities.

Almost any country in which elementary, secondary, and higher education were sponsored primarily by governmental units was sure to be one in which a majority of the libraries were government-sponsored. Obviously, the Drexel-Tehran dean-chairman's activities were directed primarily toward improving the library education of students who were destined to work for a common employer, the government, at one or another level. Student affiliation with the government implied many things. In both countries, certain curricular units were introduced to explain the governmental setting in which the students expected to work, e.g., the content and examples used in library administration and service courses. As government budgets rose or fell, the shortage or superfluity of library positions was directly affected.

Modestly paid but secure, government employment tended to attract relatively timid, unambitious, and conservative persons who possessed little entrepreneurial cash and few influential contacts. Most of these persons had some public spiritedness and some ideas of doing good. Traditionally, government employment attracted people for whom the red tape, extensive clerical work, and delays of bureaucratic life were not particularly offensive. For these reasons, and perhaps for others, also, government employment attracted large numbers of women.

In both the USA and Iran, the government employment situation brought large numbers of women to library science. Three fourths of the Tehran enrollment and four fifths of the Drexel enrollment were women, and the percents in the field were the same. The dominance of women was significant to librarianship, not only in its being able to take advantage of women's strengths but in its suffering from their weaknesses, also. In both countries, the discrimination existing in many other occupations and librarianship's status as a junior level profession not requiring a doctorate may have been additional forces influencing women toward it.

The forces operating against such female library dominance were (a) the presence of a few positions which paid well enough to attract ambitious men, (b) religious strictures, against women teaching in boy's schools, for instance, and (c) the job competition from some male heads of families. Obviously, these forces were not sufficiently strong in either Iran or the United States to force male dominance of librarianship. Only Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Pakistan, West Asian countries, had male domination to this extent.

As a final generalization, it may even have been true, that, since most USA and

and Iranian library positions were sponsored by the government, then most librarians were women. Such a cause and effect relationship may seem simple and obvious, though the true situation may have been much more complicated than it sounds here. What little evidence existed from private institutions on the American side suggested their percent female to be nearly as large as that for government institutions, for instance.

Obviously, this discussion about government sponsorship, women and other similarities contains at least five weaknesses. While certainly of fundamental importance, the generalizations about government sponsorship and women are not as closely related to the dean vs. chairman comparison as might be hoped for. These situations were among those basic to the situation in which the dean-chairman worked, but they were not as crucial a part of administrative activities as might be wished for in this discussion. The difficulty of isolating the particular man's influence from that of the position itself reduced the number of generalizations possible, also. A third weakness is the inconsequential though perhaps intriguing nature of many of the similarities, e.g., the plastic telephone on each desk and the monthly faculty meeting schedule. A fourth criticism is the obviousness of many of the generalizations. However, obviousness can be defended by the proposition that each generalization must be proposed and established before comparative library science can be developed into a useful academic discipline. When fundamentally important, such generalizations must be established objectively, even though they are obvious. The fifth weakness in this discussion is that the two generalizations chosen for extended consideration may not be the most significant generalizations possible in the situation. This fact is difficult to ascertain, of course. Finally, without full sets of comparative national data, the discussion is partially dependent on subjective impressions, and certain similarities may be hidden from view.

Now, and in conclusion, other students must test these generalizations in other countries. Both of them seem likely to be true generally, except perhaps in conservative Asian countries where few women are allowed to work in public places. If these two generalization are established as being widely true, then one small forward step will have been taken toward a greater understanding of comparative library science.

2/8/73